

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended. In response to the Office Action mailed 1/27/06, Applicant is filing this amendment. Claims 1-20 are pending.

In the Office Action mailed 1/27/06, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Everett et al. (U.S. Patent 6,220,510; "Everett").

Applicant submits that Everett discloses a multi-application IC card which processes two or more applications. As noted by the Examiner, Everett does teach a static and dynamic space, along with a public space. However, Applicant submits that static data space **103**, public data space **105** and dynamic data space **107** are utilized for data storage. Code memory space **203** contains the program instructions for an application stored on the IC card (col. 9, lines 15-16 of Everett). The claims of the present application clearly state that a main program is stored in the static portion and functional programs are overlayed in the overlay space, which is included in the dynamic portion of the memory. Thus, where data may be shared in Everett, the claims of the application recite programs.

The Examiner further states that the public space contains data passed between two applications. However, passing of shared data through the public space in Everett is not the same or equivalent as overlaying programs. Applicant has amended the independent claims to clearly recite that the overlay is the loading of a currently used functional program over a previously used functional program in the overlay space. The main program accesses a prelude associated with the functional operation and the associated prelude provides a corresponding resource identifier of a particular functional program that performs the functional operation to the main program. The particular functional program is then loaded into the overlay space. The use of the associated prelude and the corresponding resource identifier allows the main program to perform the functional operation without identifying the particular functional program to be loaded into the overlay space.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the amended claims overcome the Examiner's rejections based on Everett for the reasons noted above.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection and allow pending claims 1-20, as amended.

If there are any fee shortages related to this response, please charge such fee shortages to Sigmatel Inc.'s USPTO Deposit Account No. 50-1415.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK, HARRISON & MARKISON, LLP
(Customer No. 34,399)

Date: 4-27-2006

By: William W. Kidd
William W. Kidd
Reg. No. 31,772
Phone: (512) 263-1842
Fax No: (512) 263-1469
Email: wkidd@texaspatents.com